Document 105

Filed 04/02/2007

Page 1 of 3

Video Software Dealers Association et al v. Schwarzenegger et al

Case 5:05-cv-04188-RMW

Doc. 105

Plaintiffs Video Software Dealers Association and Entertainment Software Association respectfully submit this Notice of Supplemental Authority to notify the Court of an Opinion issued by the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit on November 27, 2006. This Opinion affirmed an order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois permanently enjoining enforcement of an Illinois state law that would have imposed criminal fines and imprisonment on persons who sold or rented to minors certain sexually explicit or "violent" video games, as defined by the statute in question. *Entertainment Software Ass'n, et al. v. Blagojevich*, ____ F. 3d ____, Nos. 06-1012, 06-1048 & 06-1161 (7th Cir., Nov. 27, 2006). The defendants appealed only that part of the district court's order enjoining enforcement of the ban on sexually explicit video games. The Court held, *inter alia*, that the statute was not sufficiently narrowly tailored and thus violated the First Amendment, and that the law impermissibly compelled speech in violation of the First Amendment.

Specifically relevant to the motions for summary judgment pending in the instant case, the Seventh Circuit held that the statute at issue did not use the least restrictive means to achieve the statute's goal, and noted that the State "could have simply passed legislation increasing awareness among parents of the voluntary [Entertainment Software Ratings Board] ratings system." Slip Op., p. 16 (citing 44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island, 517 U.S. 484, 507 (1996); Linmark Assocs., Inc. v. Willingboro Twp., 431 U.S. 85, 97 (1977)).

The Court also held that the statute in question unconstitutionally compelled speech because it required, *inter alia*, the placement of a large "18" sticker on the packages of games that were found to be sexually explicit under the terms of the statute. Slip Op., pp. 17-19. The Court held that this labeling requirement was subject to strict scrutiny, and that it was not narrowly tailored to achieve the statute's objectives. *Id.* at 18-19.

26 ///

///

///

27 ///

28 ///

1	A true and correct copy of this Opinion is attached hereto for the Court's convenience.	
2	DATED: Amil 2, 2007	Respectfully submitted.
3	DATED: April 2, 2007.	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP THEODORE J. BOUTROUS, JR.
4		H. MARK LYON ETHAN D. DETTMER
5		DITTING D. DET TIVER
6		By: /s/ Ethan D. Dettmer
7		
8		JENNER & BLOCK LLP PAUL M. SMITH
9		KATHERINE A. FALLOW AMY L. TENNEY
10 11		MATTHEW S. HELLMAN 601 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
12		Washington, D.C. 20005 Telephone: (202) 639-6000
13		Facsimile: (202) 639-6066 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
14		VIDEO SOFTWARE DEALERS ASSOCIATION and ENTERTAINMENT SOFTWARE ASSOCIATION
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		